

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 12, 26, 87-89, 91, 93, 98 and 102 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19, 90, 92, 94-97 and 99-101 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 87 are amended. Claims 17 and 20-23 are cancelled.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7 and 93.

Claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19, 90, 92, 94-97 and 99-101 are withdrawn from consideration being held to a non-elected species. However, it should be noted that claims 1 and 87 requires no material element additional to those required by the species claims, and each of the species claims require all the limitations of claims 1 and 87, therefore claims 1 and 87 are **generic** to claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19, 90, 92, 94-97 and 99-101. In the event that claims 1 and 87 are found allowable, the Applicant requests rejoinder of claims 4, 6, 8-11, 13-16, 18, 19, 90, 92, 94-97 and 99-101.

I. Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). The objection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to the "parking drive judging means," the Examiner's attention is drawn to Fig. 6, Article 43 and page 71, second full paragraph, for example. Fig. 6 shows a display device 4 which informs the driver that shift lever 8 is shifted to the reverse gear position by overlaying a telop 43 that signals "reverse gear."

With respect to a "parking end judging means," the Examiner's attention is drawn to Fig. 7, Article 45 and page 72 first and second full paragraphs, for example. Fig. 7 shows a display for containing a telop 44 showing an obstacle detection by the back sonar 17 or corner sensor 18, and a telop 45 showing the parking end. Page 72, first and second full paragraphs, for example, show how the invention integrates information from back sonar 17 or corner

sensor 18 to determine that an obstacle is present and therefore warn the driver by way of telop 45 or telop 43.

With respect to the "storing means for storing a select condition," the Examiner's attention is drawn to Fig. 3 and page 67, line 7 through page 68, line 20 in reference to storage memory 29, for example. Fig. 3 is a block diagram showing a parking assist ECU 6 of the first embodiment. The parking assist ECU 6 contains a digital signal processor (DSP) for controlling the overall system of the device. The DSP 20 carries out a parking assist process by use of programs and data stored in a program memory 27 and a data memory 28.

With respect to the "select means for selecting a display condition of the drive assist information," the Examiner's attention is drawn to Fig. 3 and page 65, lines 6-17, for example. When the driver operates a shift lever 8 of a transmission of the vehicle 1 to change the advancing direction of the vehicle to a backward direction, the parking assist ECU 6 causes the information display device 4 to display a predictive traveling path curve 5A and white lines 5B on the screen thereof.

We respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 12, 26, 87-89, 91, 93, 98 and 102 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for example. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 1 and for similarly recited features in independent claim 87, the Examiner's attention is drawn to page 64, line 23 through page 65 line 5, Fig. 4A: vehicle 1, guide lines 5B, and predicted path 5A, for example. The Examiner asserts that it is unclear how exactly the vehicle traveling path can be predicted. Pages 64-69 of the specification teach that the ECU takes varied inputs such as steering angle, sonar, camera, etc. to determine obstacles and thereby predict a path of the vehicle. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear how the guide lines prolonged from the

lines can define the width of the vehicle body. Pages 64-69 and Figs. 4A-4C, for example, illustrate how the white guide lines 5B extend from lines to define the width of the vehicle body on the image of the area existing in the vehicle advancing direction. The guide lines 5B narrow to show a perspective view of the width of the vehicle in the direction of travel.

With respect to the Examiner's rejections regarding claims 7 and 93, the Examiner's attention is drawn to the discussion above with respect to the drawings. In summary, "the parking end judging means" is shown in Fig. 7, Article 45 and page 72, first and second paragraphs, for example. With respect to the "storing means for storing a select condition for displaying the predictive traveling path and/or guide lines," the Examiner's attention is drawn to Fig. 3 and page 67, line 7 through page 68, line 20 regarding storage memory 29, for example. With respect to the "select means," the Examiner's attention is drawn to Fig. 3 and page 65, line 6-17, for example.

We respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

III. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 26 and 102 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 87 were amended responsive to the Examiner's suggestion. Furthermore, claims 1 and 87 were amended to correct antecedent basis with respect to "the lines."

We respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 12, 87-89, 91 and 98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shimizu (EP 0835796) in view of Schofield (W0 96/38319) and Kakinami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,855). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claim 1 and for similarly recited features in independent claim 87, the cited prior art does not teach a drive assist means for overlaying guide lines

prolonged from lines defining the width of a vehicle body on the image area existing in the vehicle advancing direction.

With respect to Shimizu, the Examiner concedes on page 6 of the Office Action that Shimizu fails to teach guide lines that are prolonged from the lines defining the width of the vehicle body.

With respect to Schofield, Schofield teaches in Fig. 3 that lines 50 and 52 dynamically adjust with respect to distance Q. Because the width of a car does not change dynamically with respect to distance Q, the overlaid lines 50 and 52 are not guide lines projecting from lines defining the width of the vehicle body.

Furthermore, with respect to Kakinami, Fig. 2 and Schofield, Figs. 3, 8, 12 and 23, the Examiner suggests that road line markings are lines overlaid on the display means prolonged from lines defining the width of a vehicle. This is not correct. First of all, the road line markings are not overlaid on the image but rather are part of the image captured by the cameras. Second of all, as is well known in the art, road line markings do not define the width of a vehicle but define an area in which the vehicle is to remain within. For example, Fig. 3 of Schofield shows three different vehicles all of which are located within road line markings that do not define the width of the vehicle.

With respect to Schofield Fig. 6, graphic overlay 70A and 70B are hash marks intended to illustrate to the driver the anticipated path of movement of vehicle 10. Therefore, overlays 70A and 70B move to show the anticipated vehicle path but do not represent guide lines projecting from lines defining the width of the vehicle body on the image area, as recited in claims 1 and 87.

We respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26 and 102 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shimizu in view of Schofield and Kakinami, and further in view of Ong (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,317). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ong does not teach the deficiencies of Shimizu, Schofield nor Kakinami as described above with respect to claims 1 and 87. Therefore, Shimizu, Schofield, Kakinami in view of Ong do not support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

We respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John A. Radi
Registration No. 59,345

JAO:JAR/tbm

Date: January 24, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--